





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS

John. Talbot
A PRIMARY CHARGE

ADDRESSED TO THE

CLERGY OF HIS DIOCESE,

BY

CHARLES THOMAS,
ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

London,
RIVINGTONS, WATERLOO PLACE;

HIGH STREET, | TRINITY STREET,
Oxford. | Cambridge.

1864.

LONDON :
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

PRIMARY CHARGE,

1864.

MY REV. AND DEAR BRETHREN,

WE are assembled together for the first time within these sacred walls under circumstances of no ordinary interest to us all. Events, some of which deeply concern the whole body of the Church, while others specially affect our own diocese, have come to pass since you were last here convened, and were listening to words of fatherly instruction from one who has now ceased from his labours, and has been called, as we humbly trust, to enter into that rest which remaineth for the people of God.

I can well divine the mingled feelings of regret and gratitude with which you will each recur to this topic, feelings in which I myself must claim to share. There will scarcely be one among us who will not be touched by the memory of some act of personal kindness on the part of him who so lately occupied the chair I now fill, of some lasting obliga-

tion conferred, of some counsels of wisdom imparted to us in a spirit of gentleness and love. I have thus, as you see, sought to identify myself with my clergy in thankful acknowledgments to that single-minded and beneficent prelate under whose mild rule you were in days past privileged to minister; for it is now nearly thirty years since I was called, by the providence of God, to enter into a portion of his labours, and to take charge of a section¹ of the Lord's vineyard in the north of England over which he before presided; and having been twice appointed his successor in the episcopal office, while I look back with grateful recollection to the valued aid which he tendered to me, when a novice in the discharge of its responsible duties, I cannot refrain from expressing my sorrow that the like aid should no longer be at hand, when I follow him in the more arduous and trying position to which I am now called.

But besides these acknowledgments of individual obligation, in which we shall cordially unite, let me bear my willing testimony to the important services Archbishop Sumner has rendered to the Church of

¹ That division of the archdeaconry of Richmond, belonging to the see of Chester, which was transferred to the see of Ripon on its creation in the year 1836. It extends from the extreme north-western point of Yorkshire to within nine miles of York, and contains 123 churches, forming about one-third, in respect of area, though not of population, of the present diocese of Ripon.

Christ, and more especially to the Church of England, by his labours, whether literary or administrative. In his work entitled "A Treatise on the Records of the Creation," and in his volume on "the Evidences of Christianity," he has provided us with supports to our faith, most seasonable in the present times of trouble and rebuke, as has recently been attested by one of the highest authorities of the Gallican Church ; in his "Apostolical Preaching Considered," he has set before us in an impressive manner what should be the substance of our teaching from the pulpit, if we would tread in the steps of those who were commissioned by our Lord Himself to proclaim His Gospel to the world ; and in his "Practical Commentary on the New Testament" he inculcates the doctrines and enforces the duties which he himself preached and practised with blameless consistency throughout the whole course of his ministerial life. His administrative labours, during the twenty years he presided over the Diocese of Chester, were signally blessed by the largely increased provision for the spiritual wants of its manufacturing districts, which are still reaping the benefit of his exemplary zeal in promoting the welfare of his flock. Cares and toils of a different character awaited him in his last province of ecclesiastical duty. But here also the government of his Diocese and his Primacy in the Church was signalized by the same spirit of gentle-

ness and love, the same spirit of unwearied devotion to the functions of his sacred calling, the same calm and unruffled temperament which enabled him, through grace, to pass unscathed through the trials that beset him in his arduous path ; till at last he was permitted to close his prolonged career of pious usefulness amidst the affectionate and respectful regrets of an attached clergy and a grateful Church.

To follow such a Primate is indeed no easy task ; and I must entreat your indulgent interpretation of my conduct, should I, in the course of my ministry among you, fail to satisfy expectations which the example of such a predecessor might not unnaturally raise. At any period of our Church's history, it must have been felt as a most solemn responsibility, to be invested with so weighty a charge as that which now devolves upon me ; but with the prospects before her, and under the conflict of opinion which now exists, its gravity will be the more profoundly felt. My hope and humble confidence is, that He who has laid the burthen upon me will enable me to bear it ; and that in conscious weakness, I may be able to realize that strength which is made perfect in man's infirmity.

Diocesan Sta-
tistics.

Postponing for the moment those matters of public interest to the Church at large to which I have alluded, I will proceed to set forth, as clearly and concisely as I can, the present

condition of our diocese, in some matters that concern its ecclesiastical statistics ; we shall then, if we are once more permitted to meet here in solemn assembly, have a starting-point from which we may measure our progress in future years.

But, first, addressing myself to you, my Reverend Brethren, members of the Metropolitan Church of Canterbury, let me record my grateful sense of the obligation which this Cathedral owes to the Very Rev. the Dean, for having himself undertaken, at a great sacrifice of his very valuable time and labour, to provide an afternoon Sermon each Sunday. When almost every congregation in the diocese has the advantage of a second sermon on the Lord's Day, it is difficult to discover any valid reason why the congregation assembling within these walls should be denied that privilege ; and all honour be to him, who resolved that they should no longer be debarred from it. I trust that a measure which I have recently adopted may tend gradually to lighten the Dean's labours in this respect ; and that the Order of Honorary Canons, founded by me a year since, may be available for this service, when each is called in his turn to preach his annual Sermon. The Cathedral bodies are generally exerting themselves to provide additional spiritual instruction for the inhabitants of their respective cities ; and I should have been sorry, had that of

Canterbury been backward in such a movement.

Ruridecanal
Action.

Next let me take this opportunity of thanking my Rural Deans for the willing aid they have afforded me in my endeavours to ascertain the state of the diocese in respect of the fabric of the churches and of the parsonage-houses. Ruridecanal organization I have always felt to be of great importance to a Bishop, for the efficient administration of the affairs of his See; and I sincerely hope that Chapters will be regularly held from time to time in each Deanery, for the discussion of subjects bearing upon the welfare of the Church. It is through such organization that the Bishop can most promptly and most surely ascertain the views and opinions of his Clergy on matters which are of interest to the Church at the moment: through this, the clergy may, from time to time, receive communications from their Diocesan, and be put in possession of his wishes and directions when action shall be called for, or a public expression of opinion be deemed desirable; and thus, taking counsel together, they may be able to mature measures advantageous to the diocese and the Church. I am acquainted with some such signal instances of important results from active local exertions in single Rural Deaneries, that I cannot refrain from pointing out to you what may be done,

if the leading persons, Clergy as well as Laity, resolve to co-operate for the welfare of the Church in each. The first example I will adduce is that of the Deanery of Southwark, in the diocese of Winchester. Its total population was half a million, and it contained sixty-three benefices, many of them so poorly endowed, that ten of the number had incomes averaging no more than 108*l.* a year each. An Association was formed for the Augmentation of Poor Benefices in the Deanery. The Association raised 5000*l.* by donations and annual subscriptions; the several Incumbents, by sermons and other means, 5000*l.* more; grants from the Ecclesiastical Commissioners doubled these sums; and with a total of 20,000*l.*, the income of every Incumbent in the Deanery, that was previously below that amount, was raised to 200*l.* a year. The Association, having thus accomplished its proposed work, has lately, as I understand, been dissolved. In the Deanery of Cambridge, a similar effort for another object has met with the like success. The population of the town and neighbourhood had so increased, that a large proportion was beyond the reach of proper parochial supervision by the existing staff of clergy. It was resolved that a vigorous effort should be made to render the ministrations of the Church commensurate with the wants of the people; and the result of this attempt to meet local

wants from local resources has been, the addition of three Curates within the Deanery, so that there is now one clergyman to every 1500 souls in the most populous parish; the erection of a free temporary church, with school attached; the raising of funds for building a free permanent church in one of the most destitute districts; and an extra Service and Curate provided by the offertory in another parish, besides the awakening of a more general interest in the spiritual welfare of the neighbourhood.

There can be no doubt that the increase of the endowments of our poorer benefices is one of the crying wants of our times. In this diocese, as far as I have been able to ascertain, there are as many as 21 benefices under 100*l.* a year, and 102 under 200*l.* a year; and as the grants made by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to meet benefactions for this purpose are open to all, I cannot but earnestly hope that in our diocese this seasonable aid may be largely sought for from that quarter. This end would be much promoted did there exist in this diocese a Society with the threefold object of aiding in the increase of Church accommodation by the building of new churches, or the enlargement of old ones; in the increase of the endowments of poor benefices, and in the building of parsonage-houses; and it is my full intention, after consultation with the leading clergy and laity of the diocese,

to make a great effort for the establishment of a Society for these three purposes.

The Report of our Diocesan Inspector of Schools presents, I am happy to say, a Diocesan
Schools. cheerful view of the state of education in the diocese. There is a greater number of certificated masters, in proportion to the uncertificated, than there was in the previous year. There is a considerable improvement in the standard of religious knowledge in our Schools; and this we may notice with the greater satisfaction, as there was at one time much reason to fear, that under the new regulations of the Revised Code, the scriptural teaching in them might labour under some discouragement. But although, happily, we have not suffered in this respect, it appears that the recent changes have led to an almost total neglect of Geography, Grammar, and History: so that, as regards the general training of the mind, the pupils are suffering from the abandonment of these branches of education in our Elementary Schools. The state of discipline generally prevailing in them is said to be remarkably good; but the evil of removing children prematurely continues unabated, two-thirds of those in our Church Schools being under ten years of age, and only one in seventeen having reached the age of thirteen! The deficiencies of this scanty education can only be supplied by the establishment of Night Schools,

which have been tried in many quarters with very beneficial results ; and it is gratifying to perceive that there are 128 parishes where there are adult Schools, in which the clergyman takes an active part. As to the effect of the Revised Code on School Funds, it is not easy at this early stage to pronounce ; but I am glad to believe, that no schools have as yet been closed from want of pecuniary means ; and the very valuable exertions of our Diocesan Education Society, which has so largely benefited our parishes, will, I trust, help to prevent such a calamity.

Book-hawking.

It is satisfactory to find that successful Book-hawking Associations exist in the diocese ; and it is to be wished that their operations could be made coextensive with it. No doubt can be entertained of the important influence they exert, by offering wholesome and edifying literature where immoral and irreligious publications might otherwise find their way. Some very curious statistics have been lately published, which hold out great encouragement to such efforts. There is substantial ground for believing that the sale of obnoxious works is considerably on the decrease. It has been ascertained that about three years ago, the circulation of directly immoral publications was about fifty-two thousand weekly, while at present it is estimated to reach no more than nine thousand ; the abundance

of cheap literature of a wholesome kind having fairly driven them from the field. The total number of free-thinking serial publications which now exist does not reach above five thousand weekly; and it is remarked by those who have had opportunities of examining them, that they now adopt a tone unknown at a former period, and that they generally attempt, as they express it, "to show that rationalism is not irresponsible²." As to religious literature, it occupies only a secondary place among the weekly issues; but in comparison with other monthly periodicals, those on the subject of religion far outnumber each of them: they amount to upwards of one hundred, and their monthly issue reaches to nearly two millions of copies. Besides this, there is a periodical republication of old standard works, such as "Jeremy Taylor's Life of Christ," "Pilgrim's Progress," the "History of England," and a compendious "Gazetteer," with several others, which supply the Book-hawker's store; and of this class of work, the issue is now four times as great as it was in the year 1830. These certainly are favourable symptoms, and will, I trust, induce us to persevere in our endeavours to disseminate far and wide among our people such wholesome reading as may help to instruct the mind and edify the soul,

² These details are collected from the "Publishers' Circular" of May 16, 1864.

and will stimulate you, my Reverend Brethren, in your exertions for the establishment of Book-hawking societies where they are not at present existing. The last report of the West Dartford and Kent Suburban Book-hawking Society is especially cheering; for though it comprises no more than twenty parishes, yet the sale of books and maps for the present year amounts to above 300*l.*, as against 184*l.* the year previous.

Abstract of
Returns.

I have to tender to you all my acknowledgments for the punctuality and precision with which you have replied to my inquiries respecting the state of your several parishes³. I have now on record the number of legally constituted benefices, as well as of chapels of ease in the diocese; the number of resident incumbents, as well as non-resident, and the various reasons for their non-residence: I know how many parsonages there are, and how many parishes are yet without glebe-houses; the rate of addition to the parsonage-houses within the last three years being seven annually, so that it would take twelve years to supply with residences for the incumbents those eighty-four parishes which are yet without them. I have ascertained the number of services in each church, and the number of churches in which there is one service only on the Sunday; the periods at which the Holy

³ Appendix A.

Communion is administered in each parish, and the number of communicants ; the number of schools in the diocese for the education of the poor in the principles of the Church of England, and the number of candidates confirmed by myself since my accession to the See. Should it please God to permit me to meet you at another Visitation, I shall hope to be able to report progress in several of these particulars. There are still, I am sorry to say, sixty-five churches in which the Holy Communion is administered less than six times a year. I do not by any means desire to fix this as an adequate number ; but less frequent opportunities of partaking of this blessed rite must surely be prejudicial to the spiritual welfare of a congregation. If the inward and spiritual grace of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper be the Body and Blood of Christ, verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful therein after a heavenly and spiritual manner ; if to those who partake of it in sincerity and truth, remission of sins be the necessary consequence ; if the benefits they obtain thereby are the strengthening and refreshing of their souls ; if the sanctifying grace of the Holy Spirit be there conferred ; if the Holy Eucharist be a federal rite, in which, while man renews his covenant with God, God renews His covenant with man, giving him a fresh pledge of future blessing, another earnest of final salvation ;

and if the believer's union with his Saviour be thus more closely cemented,—it surely cannot be the faithful pastor's wish to stint his flock of this rich pasture. It will be yours rather to provide them with their meat in due season; and this spiritual food, so supporting to their souls, you will not deny them. I cannot but hope that those of my Reverend Brethren to whom these remarks may apply, will not think they have placed that holy ordinance on a proper footing in their parishes until they shall have succeeded in establishing what approaches more nearly to a monthly communion. There are, I find, forty-six churches in which there is only one service on the Sunday. There may doubtless be sufficient reason, in some cases, for such a state of things, as there are several legally consolidated parishes in the diocese; but where it is possible there should be two, I hope that nothing will prevent the immediate establishment of a second.

Church
Missions.

I have not, at the present moment, any return of the parishes in which no appeal is annually made in behalf of Church missions; but I am afraid there are still several in which the important obligation of aiding to carry out the Saviour's command, that the Gospel should be preached to every creature, has not been pressed upon the consciences of the people. I trust that the Pastoral Letter on this subject which has been

circulated by the four Archbishops, will have its effect, and that in every parish an organized effort will be made to assist in the maintenance and multiplication of Christian missions. Whether we regard the vast number of our own poor who emigrate to distant lands, and who will lapse into heathenism if they have not the ministrations of the Church to foster the spirit of religion and keep them stedfast in the faith; or whether we look to the enormous pagan population over which the empire of Britain extends, as well as the hundreds of millions of heathen who are beyond it, and who seem, in the name of the Saviour of the world, to demand of us the communication of those principles of light and life with which we ourselves are blessed; I know not how, in either case, any clergyman can evade the solemn obligation which weighs upon him, of calling upon his parishioners to aid one or other of the Societies that further these objects. Let each separate parish then raise its contribution for the work; and let one of the annual sermons delivered from your pulpit be in behalf of Church of England Missions, so that no portion of our Church, in this her day of trial, shall be found heedless of this call to devotion to her Saviour's service.

I perceive that there are 126 churches in which the Sacrament of Baptism is not administered at the

stated times, when the congregation are present at the service. I am quite aware of the difficulty there may be in restoring the order of the Church in this particular, after long desuetude. But besides the direct injunction of the Church, there are such strong reasons in support of the practice prescribed, that I would urge those of my Reverend Brethren who do not follow the requirements of the Rubric, to use their best endeavours to return to the regular usage. Surely we cannot be justified in depriving infants, at their baptism, of the united prayers of the whole assembled congregation; nor should we think it a light matter to deprive the congregation itself of the benefit of being reminded from time to time, in the language of the solemn service, how that baptism doth represent unto them their profession, which is to follow the example of our Saviour Christ, and be made like unto Him, so that after the pattern of His Death and Resurrection, they should die from sin, and rise again unto righteousness, continually mortifying all evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living. The service is indeed a sermon which may well, under God's blessing, awaken the conscious sinner and the careless liver to a sense of their estrangement from their Christian profession, and of peril to their souls, should they persist in their ungodly courses.

Much uneasiness has been felt from the frequently repeated assertion that the number of those who have sought Holy Orders within the last few years has considerably diminished, and that the proportion of candidates from the universities has decreased. Some facts would seem to contradict these statements; for between the years 1851 and 1861, according to the last census, the number of clergy in England and Wales had risen from 17,621 to 19,195, giving an addition of 1574 during that decade; and out of 285 candidates ordained at Christmas, 1863, 203 were from Oxford or Cambridge, 22 from Dublin and Durham Universities, the rest from Theological Colleges, from the London University, and from St. Bees' and St. Aidan's, or Literates. It is obvious, however, that the increased number of poor benefices, and the opportunities which are now constantly occurring of more lucrative employment through competitive examination, or in other ways, are calculated to influence unfavourably the supply of candidates for the ministry; and the vast increase of new churches, to which deserving curates are appointed as incumbents, as well as the number of old churches in which the staff of curates is increased, may also help to account for the difficulty of procuring such assistants at the present moment. But in spite of the undeniable increase of the total number of clergy between the years

1851 and 1861, it is certain, from correct statistical returns, that the number of candidates ordained as deacons has diminished in the last ten years, on an average of sixty-five per year. This apparent inconsistency between the known increase in the total number of clergy since 1851, and the known decrease of the number of candidates for ordination in the ratio above mentioned, during the same period, can only be accounted for by the increased longevity of the clergy between the years 1851 and 1861; a fact which the carefully prepared tables I have in my possession will clearly prove⁴.

Increase of the
Episcopate. Now the fact of a large increase in the number of the Clergy in England and Wales, together with the vast annual addition to our population, forces the more strongly upon our attention the need of some increase in the Episcopate. That some of our dioceses are too large for effective Ecclesiastical supervision, has long been felt; and expression was given to that opinion a few years since in a Memorial, signed by a large body of persons of rank and consideration in the country, distinguished by no special bias either in religion or politics. There are two ways of supplying the acknowledged want; either by the Subdivision of Dioceses, or by the appointment of Suffragan

⁴ Appendix B.

Bishops. The Diocese of Exeter, at the present moment, most urgently demands such relief; as well from the age and infirmity of the venerable prelate who presides over it, as from some peculiar circumstances, touching its extent, its form, and population. It is much to be regretted, that all our hopes of a separate See for Cornwall should have been recently frustrated. No doubt there will be difficulty in raising an adequate stipend for the new Bishop; but I confess that I have heard no sufficient reason for the refusal, supposing this obstacle to be overcome. The question of a Suffragan Bishop for the Diocese of Exeter, is, I believe, yet under discussion; and objections to the measure have been raised which I conceive to be entirely groundless. It is imagined that there might be a claim on the part of the Suffragan to succession on the next vacancy of the See. But the Crown would justly repudiate any such pretension, as fettering the free exercise of its patronage; nor could it ever be asked to acquiesce in the consecration of a clergyman with right of succession, who was not of its own choice. The Suffragan himself, at any rate, would never venture to advance such a claim. He would probably be some dignitary of the Church, or well-beneficed clergyman, who, on the death of his Principal, would retire upon his preferment, still bearing the Episcopal title, but ceasing to exercise any of its

functions, unless invited to do so by some prelate who sought his services on special occasions. The status of such a person would be precisely analogous to that of a retired colonial bishop, living in this country; and the presence of such has frequently proved beneficial in cases of emergency.

As a means of facilitating the attendance at public worship on the part of our rapidly increasing population, there has arisen an Institution entitled "The National Society for Promoting Freedom of Worship in the Church." I have been repeatedly asked to give it my countenance, but I have not, as yet, felt myself at liberty to do so. I fully recognize the importance of having all our churches open to the parishioners without any payment for their seats. Let them enjoy the ministry of the Word as they do the ministry of the Sacraments, without money and without price; and if this were all, I should entirely sympathize with the movement. But I believe it transgresses these limits, and supersedes the ancient rule of the Church which assigns to the Churchwardens, subject to the control of the Ordinary, the duty of seating each of the parishioners, that is, of assigning to each inhabitant or family certain places in the church to which they may resort for public worship without let or hindrance, unless it shall be found necessary, for special reasons, to make some different arrangement sanc-

Society for
Promoting
Freedom of
Worship.

tioned by the churchwardens and confirmed by the Ordinary. The privilege thus by law established has in many instances been grossly abused, and an illegal claim set up to a property in those seats, the right of letting or of selling them having been asserted, even though the party should cease to reside in the parish. It is important, in the interest of the parishioners themselves, that all persons should be disabused of so erroneous an impression. As soon as an individual ceases to reside in a parish he ceases to be a parishioner, and ceases to have any claim whatever to a seat in the parish church. It then reverts to the churchwardens, who assign it to some other party. All payments, therefore, for the purchase of pews in parish churches, and all rents demanded for the use of pews in the same, are illegal, and cannot be enforced by law. Now this new Society, if I am correctly informed, proposes to deprive the churchwardens of that function of their office which empowers them to seat the parishioners according to the above regulations, and to throw open every sitting in the church to the first comer, whenever the congregation assembles for public worship. This system is unnecessary where the church accommodation is adequate to the population, and all can without difficulty be seated; it is highly inconvenient where the number of inhabitants exceeds the capacity of the church to accommodate

them, and where confusion is likely to ensue from the competition for places before the service begins. In such a struggling crowd the aged and infirm, who need and value the public ministrations of our Church at least as much as any others, would find it in vain to persevere, and would thus probably be entirely debarred from enjoying the benefit of rights which they share in common with others. If the Society would confine itself to efforts for establishing the freedom of public worship by abolishing all payments for seats, at the same time providing adequate stipends for the clergy, without having recourse to such means for their support, it should have my willing countenance.

Clerical Sub-
scription Com-
mission.

The issue of a Royal Commission to consider and revise the various forms of subscription and declaration required to be made by the clergy has naturally attracted the anxious attention of Churchmen to its proceedings. The idea of abolishing all clerical subscription has met with very little favour either from clergy or laity. The Church has a right to exact subscription from her ministers, and her lay members may reasonably demand it of them, as a security that their teaching shall be in conformity with her doctrines. But the existing forms of subscription were too numerous and complicated, and seemed fairly to admit of some modification, without lessening the

moral obligation on the conscience of the subscribers to maintain the tenets of our Church inviolate. The labours of the Commission have been brought very nearly to a conclusion, and I confidently anticipate that the result will prove satisfactory to the members of our Church in general.

The proposal made in the year 1863 for altering the terms of subscription was couched in such language as necessarily prevented me from acceding to it. A promise of conformity to the Liturgy without any declaration of agreement with its doctrines, seemed to me to afford no sufficient security. If the clergyman who promises conformity gives a conscientious assent to the doctrine, why should he hesitate to say so? But if he be ready to promise to use our formularies, while he disbelieves the truths they enunciate, he is acting a dishonest part, and betraying the trust reposed in him. A proposition, however, having been made to me to become a member of a Commission instructed to report their opinion how far the forms of subscription to our Articles and Book of Common Prayer might be altered and simplified, consistently with due security to the declared agreement of the clergy with the doctrines of the Church, and their conformity to its ritual, I did not hesitate to give it my ready assent. I could not deny that the declaration of unfeigned assent and

consent to all and every minute detail of ritual contained in the Book of Common Prayer, as required by the Act of Uniformity, might be felt to be a burthen on the consciences of many of our clergy, although the Preamble of that Act, by speaking of conformity only, might give some reasonable colour to the less stringent interpretation of the words. Then the fact that this declaration barred the way to those only who were about to be instituted to a benefice, so that persons might be elevated to the highest offices in the Church without ever being required to make it, seemed to call for the adoption of some one Form of Assent and Subscription, which should be common to all who are admitted to any ecclesiastical preferment, while the ancient obligations of allegiance to Catholic truth were preserved. Such has been the aim of the Commission, and I trust that it has accomplished its object.

Burial Service. I now pass to that much agitated question, the Revision of the Burial Service.

You are all, most probably, aware that some years since a considerable body of the clergy, amounting to about 4000, petitioned the Legislature for relief from the grievance they felt in being compelled by law to read the service over every corpse brought to the churchyard for interment, excepting only those of persons who had died unbaptized, had been ex-

communicated, or had laid violent hands upon themselves. The petitioners⁵, however, sought not the remedy in the alteration of the Service, but in the alteration of the Law: they asked relief, but not by way of Revision. Their testimony, therefore, can be adduced only in proof of the existence of the grievance, not as a necessary argument for the mutilation of the Office. For my own part, I confess that I entertain very strong objections to the changes proposed to be introduced in it; and I feel that I owe it to you to state distinctly on the present occasion the grounds of those objections. That there are evils and inconveniences connected with the present Burial Service, it would be in vain to deny; but as regards the proposed mode of palliating these evils, I believe the remedy to be worse than the disease. Our office for the interment of the dead seems to be as perfect a model of a service for Christian burial as is to be found in any of the liturgies of Christendom. It breathes throughout a truly Christian spirit; and I should indeed be loth to be a party to the mutilation of that which has such strong claims to our veneration and affection. We are urged to blot out all words of hope from the Office. But an order of Christian burial without one single expression of hope touching him whose

⁵ Appendix C.

body we are committing to the ground, which observes a silence that is intended to render the service suitable to the notorious profligate, however unsuitable it may be to a devout member of the Church, is an anomaly which will, I hope, never be admitted. We are not, as I conceive, reduced to any such necessity as this, in order to satisfy the consciences of the clergy who use it. If, indeed, the officiating minister can undertake to pronounce of a surety, that the party died a hardened and impenitent sinner, a real difficulty presents itself, and the grievance in this instance must be acknowledged. But how very rarely is it given to man to have such absolute assurance as this ! And if the minister have it not, why should he grudge to a departed brother the expression of a hope, however faint it may be, that he will be accepted through the mercy of his heavenly Father, and the merits of his Saviour ? “ Better to be charitable and hope the best,” as has been well observed, “ than rashly to condemn,” if not in the letter, at any rate in heart and spirit. There are, surely, different degrees of hope ; degrees which range between the faintest and most feeble feeling, and that which is akin to a confident assurance : and, unless a clergyman is prepared to judge before the time, to arrogate to himself the gift of discerning the thoughts and intents of the heart, then in almost every case which comes before him,

he should be willing to give utterance to the hope which the Church authorizes him to express. The strongest argument however, to my own mind, against the alteration of the Service, is its consistency with the principles of Holy Scripture. We find St. Paul addressing the whole body of the Church of Corinth, without any exception, as *saints* ; persons, that is to say, who having received the grace of baptism, were thereby made members of Christ, and were therefore to be treated and addressed as such, although some of them were known to be living in open sin : so to be treated, because he could not pronounce them reprobates, cut off from communion with the body of Christ, and thus deprived of all the rights and privileges appertaining to this communion. The question then naturally suggests itself, why should the conscience of a minister of our Church in the present day be more scrupulous than that of St. Paul ? Why should he hesitate to utter an expression of the faintest hope respecting those who die in a doubtful state, when it is impossible for him to pronounce them of a certainty to be for ever outcasts from the flock of Christ, and from the household of God ? If we so lower the tone of the Burial Service, as to suit the ungodly as well as the godly, I know not where we are to stop, or how we can with any consistency refrain from dealing with all the other portions of

the Book of Common Prayer in like manner. The General Confession presumes that all who will use it are penitent believers: are we prepared so to remodel it, that it may also suit the impenitent and unbelieving? The same may be said of the Litany and all other portions of the Daily Service, but it is more especially true of the occasional offices of the Church. They treat all whom they concern as partakers of Christian membership; and if the same scruples which deter a clergyman from expressing, in the Burial Service, a hope when certainty is unattainable, should operate in the use of the other offices, then must they all be reformed to meet his views, to the manifest depravation of the whole teaching of the Church. Such a change, however, I have ascertained to be repugnant to the feelings of a large majority of the clergy; and in opposition to these deliberate convictions I do not think it would be wise to attempt it.

Certain remedial alternatives have been suggested; but I cannot believe they will ever commend themselves to the members of the Church in general. A second Service, to be used at the discretion of the clergyman when he hesitates to use the present one, would, in fact, invest each clergyman with authority to sit in judgment upon every deceased parishioner, before he was judged of the Lord. A double Service, one to be used for communicants, the other for

non-communicants, is a project less objectionable, possibly, than the former, but it would be beset with difficulties, when carried out into practice, and would prove a temptation to persons to become unworthy communicants. The proposal which, as far as I have had the opportunity of observing, meets the views of the great majority of the clergy, is embodied in a series of resolutions agreed to at a meeting of the clergy of the Rural Deanery of Doncaster, in my late diocese of York. They resolved that it was not desirable, under existing circumstances, to urge any alteration of the Service itself; but that the grievance would be materially lightened if certain additions were made to the first rubric in the Office for the Burial of the Dead, so that after the words "have laid violent hands on themselves," there should follow these further exceptions,—“or have died in the commission of a crime, or in the open and professed avowal of unbelief, or have been open and notorious evil-livers, without any one being able to testify of their repentance.” The clergyman who, in accordance with this amended rubric, should bury the corpse without reading the Service, would be required to report the fact to the Bishop within fourteen days; and the Bishop's approval would protect him from any proceeding by law in consequence of the omission. This suggestion has one recommendation, that it corresponds

very nearly with the practice in the Roman Catholic Church in France, which is not, that I am aware of, attended with any inconvenience. I do not however believe that it would be accepted by the legislature of this country. Indeed, it is a matter of no small difficulty to devise any measure which shall abate the grievance as felt by the clergy, without violating the feelings of the survivors, disparaging the character of the dead, or destroying the symmetry of the offices of the Church. But there are circumstances, as I will proceed to show, under which the Service might be omitted, without any such consequences, and at the same time to the relief of the ministering clergyman. There seems to be some doubt whether, in the present state of the law, it be permitted to inter the corpse of a baptized person without the office, unless he shall have died by his own hand, or been excommunicated. If, however, it were understood to be the law, or were made the law, that whenever the friends of the deceased requested or consented that the mere interment of the corpse should take place, the clergyman would be at liberty to act accordingly, several cases of scandal, and instances of violence done to the consciences of the clergy would be obviated. The corpse of a notorious infidel was once brought to the gate of one of our public cemeteries, when the son of the deceased, stepping forward, charged the officiating minister

not to read over the body of his father a Service of which the father did not believe a word. Gladly as the clergyman would have assented to the request, had he felt himself at liberty to do so, he conceived that the law left him no alternative, and the Service was read. Then I have heard publicly cited the instance of a woman reproaching her minister for giving Christian burial to her husband, who had died an habitual drunkard. Here, again, the scandal would have been obviated, had the interposition of the friends of the departed been sufficient sanction for the omission of the Service. But we may fairly ask whether the scandal of reading the Service over persons who have led ungodly lives, would be entirely removed by the obliteration of every expression of hope? They would still be deemed worthy of Christian burial, and thus virtually be included within the verge of that hope which some would shrink from expressing. They would still, though mentally consigned by the officiating minister to perdition, be greeted by him, as he meets the corpse, with language unmeaning, unless hope be implied; language in which the Church, in the use of her Saviour's words of promise to the believer, and of Job's confident assurance that through his living Redeemer he should in his flesh see God, cheers the drooping spirit of the mourners, bids them look beyond the grave, and anticipate a joyful

resurrection for that body which is about to be committed to the earth. And yet what a mockery must not such words still be, when they issue from the lips of one who believes the deceased to be lost ! And will not as reasonable a taunt be addressed by the ungodly at the grave-side of the careless sinner, though the words of hope are no longer uttered ? I am willing to believe, that if the view I have taken of this question were present to their minds, less repugnance would be felt on the part of many of our clergy and laity to the general use of the Burial Service as it is ; and that persons would be less scandalized when they hear words of faint hope pronounced over those whose final salvation may be doubtful.

Revision of Liturgy. This question of the revision of a single office in our Liturgy, naturally leads to the consideration of its general revision. Now I am quite prepared to agree with those who maintain that resistance to reasonable change is really revolutionary. The important question, however, still remains, “What is reasonable change ?” It cannot, I apprehend, be reasonable, if it be yielded to clamour, and not to conviction : it cannot be reasonable if it be demanded in opposition to scriptural authority, or to the uniform expression of the mind of the Church in agreement with it ; or if it be such as to obliterate all traces of dogmatic Christianity

from our formularies. That this is the object of some few of those who call for changes in the Book of Common Prayer, I fear it is impossible to doubt. But there are many others who desire it in the hope of embracing a large body of Nonconformists within the pale of the Church. This I have always held to be a visionary expectation. The applications for ordination on the part of Dissenting Ministers are very frequent ; and that, not only without any alteration in our Liturgy, but because there is none—yea, even because the Church of England holds fast to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, have the ranks of Dissent been abandoned, and the ministry of our Church entered. As regards the distinctive landmarks of the Gospel, I believe the Nonconformist ministers and congregations in general feel as deep an interest in preserving them, as we ourselves, and would be as jealous of any surrender on our part of the fundamental verities of our religion, as the most devoted members of our Church. In proof and illustration of this, I may quote the language of an address which I lately received from a body of Nonconformists in a distant quarter of the globe, expressive of their thankfulness for the part I recently took in maintaining what they believe to be Scriptural Truth, and promising their prayers that light and wisdom and courage may be granted me to defend that which we each believe to be

of vital consequence. Any proposal for a general revision of the Liturgy would, I firmly believe, be met with a strenuous opposition from the great majority of the clergy of our Church, whatever may be their peculiar bias on theological questions ; so that I do not feel it necessary to enter further upon the discussion of that question, than to state that having expressed a willingness on my own part, and that of many of my Right Reverend Brethren, to consent to the appointment of a Royal Commission for the revision of the Table of Lessons, as well as for the consideration of some measure, short of the alteration of the Burial Service, for the relief of the consciences of the clergy, it is probable that on the meeting of Parliament, Her Majesty's Government may appoint a commission for these purposes.

ESSAYS AND
REVIEWS.

But there are other topics engrossing the thoughts of reflecting Churchmen which cannot be so soon dismissed. There have existed within the pale of our Church during the last two generations, as is well known to us all, disciples of two distinct schools of thought. Her arms have happily been wide enough to embrace them both ; and there never was a period within my own memory when they were more willing, than during the last few years, to dwell together in harmony, provoking each other to good works, and serving their common

Master with persevering zeal and devotion. The bias of the one section has ever been rather towards the exercise of individual liberty in the interpretation of the Sacred Writings, with less reference to the principles laid down by Church authority for their guidance ; while the other looks to that authority for direction and aid in ascertaining the true meaning of Holy Scripture : both, however, equally anxious to maintain Holy Scripture to be God's written Word, and receiving all the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament as "the very pure Word of God." Recently, however, a third party has arisen, small indeed in number, as I trust, which claims to itself the right of maintaining, that although our Holy Bible contains the Word of God, that Word is not coextensive with the Sacred Volume ; so that it is to be left to the conscience of each individual to decide which is the Divine element, and which the human, and to reject whatever does not approve itself to his verifying faculty. Each person is thus constituted a judge of that Word which our Blessed Lord says is to judge him. It will at once be seen that this new principle strikes at the very root of all fixed doctrine as deducible from Holy Scripture. For each minister and each lay member of the Church will feel himself at liberty to eliminate from the authoritative rule of Holy Scripture all such passages as are repugnant to his own views,

feelings, and convictions. One will repudiate the doctrine of the congenital corruption of human nature; another will deny that it partakes of the nature of sin; a third, that it requires any vicarious suffering to atone for it; a fourth will treat, as a fiction and impossibility, the union of the Divine and human natures in Christ, and pronounce Him mere man; so that it may well be asked, "What will become of Christianity if it is to be surrendered at the caprice of every mind?"

It may be urged, perhaps, that the Articles of our Church will act as a check upon these dangerous innovations. But how long will those Articles be suffered to exist, when the basis on which they rest has been sapped to its foundations? Nothing will then be allowed to be dogmatically affirmed, of which man's intuitive consciousness disapproves; and thus will each distinctive doctrine of Christianity disappear in its turn from the formularies of our Church; the residuum being a system which, under the name of Christianity, will be simple Deism; that Christian Deism, as it was called, which reared its head towards the close of the seventeenth century. That such tenets will ultimately triumph over the Revealed Truths which our Blessed Lord has taught, and has commissioned His Apostles to teach, we need feel no misgivings whatever. As they have outlived all other assaults of a similar kind, so will they outlive

this ; the result of each attack having been a fresh witness to the faithfulness of Him who has promised that His Church shall prevail against all that would undermine or overwhelm it. And with the view of showing you how the present position of the Church, in regard to those who are carping at her doctrines, and impugning her belief, resembles that which is recorded in her history at the period above alluded to, it may be instructive to quote a passage written more than 150 years ago, occurring in the Charge of Dr. Waterland, entitled, “ Christianity vindicated against Infidelity.” It is there stated that Infidelity had taken deep root, and had been cultivated with care, had spread its branches wide, shot up to an amazing height, and brought forth fruit in great abundance ; that the Mosaic account of the Creation was represented as mere allegory and fable ; the inspiration of Holy Writ so explained as to amount to a denial of it ; the authority of the present Canon of Scripture disputed ; the spuriousness of several passages of it, and some books of it, more than insinuated. Such were the representations made in those days ; but they were advanced chiefly by laymen, and not by those who bore office in the Church. And yet, after the lapse of a century and a half, has the Church, for her part, spread her branches far and wide, shot up to an unwonted height, and brought forth fruit in great

abundance in distant regions where the preacher's voice was never heard before, as fresh witness to the vitality of revealed religion, and its power in leavening the corruptions of the human heart. The glad tidings of salvation are now proclaimed in an hundred tongues in which they were never before that time delivered ; and Christian Churches have been founded among tribes and nations whose very existence was unknown at that date.

Of the corresponding errors at the present moment, the one which it most concerns us to combat, is that with reference to the Inspiration of Holy Scripture.

Now it certainly might have pleased Almighty God to have communicated to us His Word and will in some such supernatural manner as would have conveyed it directly in every case from Himself to the ear and heart of man, without the intervention of any subordinate agency. There would then have been no question as to the Divine and human element ; no difficulties arising from various readings, or multiplied translations. This course might have been adopted ; but then one occasion for the exercise of our faith, one of our appointed trials, would have been denied us. On the contrary, it seemed good to Him who best knows what will suit our condition, to ordain that man should be the instrument and channel by which the revelation of Himself

and of His counsels towards fallen man should be imparted. And in entrusting Prophets and Apostles with this Divine commission, He did not divest each individual of his peculiar characteristics of temperament and talent ; but permitted them to remain and to act in subservience to His gracious purposes, purified and sanctified for His service. Thus do we see that the ardent and earnest spirit of Saul, so signally manifested before his conversion, and which made him so zealous in an evil cause, yet distinguishes him, when, as the inspired Apostle Paul, he boldly preaches the Word, undaunted by the presence of his fiercest enemies ; the spirit still fervent, but now displaying its fervency in serving his new Master. And in like manner, the natural tenderness and gentleness of John the Evangelist are converted into a fountain of devout and holy love towards his God and Saviour. These peculiar features of their respective characters are decisively marked, in the mode in which they communicate the heavenly message with which they are entrusted, in the variety of style, for which there would be no room, if every single sentence and word were dictated by the Holy Ghost. Thus far, at any rate, we must allow a human element ; and thus we may be prepared to acknowledge that those who were the appointed channels of communication from God to man, were not mere machines, like the hand which obeys to

the very letter the will of the mind which directs it. There is a wide difference between the authority which belongs to each portion of a generally inspired book, and the dictation of every word by the Holy Spirit. The former may be called a plenary inspiration of Holy Scripture, though not a verbal one; and all we would maintain under the title of plenary inspiration is the universal authority of every portion of it, as written under the Divine supervision, securing the writers from error and falsehood: the exact words being in some instances dictated, as was the case with the delivery of the Decalogue. It seems to me that one passage, often quoted by persons as their justification for saying that every portion of the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament is not the Word of God, strongly supports the view here taken. I refer to the 10th, 12th, 25th, and 40th verses of the seventh chapter of St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. The Apostle there draws a distinction between the precept respecting marriage, which he repeats as a direct commandment pronounced by the Lord Jesus Christ during His lifetime, and such injunctions as he himself gave them from his own judgment, but still a judgment guided by inspiration, and therefore of binding authority. He is not pointing to a difference between a precept suggested to him by the Holy Ghost, and one prompted by his own unassisted

reason. Where he is quoting the authority of the Saviour, as he does in respect of the law of marriage, from Matt. v. 32, he uses the expression, “not I, but the Lord;” where he is delivering his own judgment, without being able to cite the direct verbal authority of Christ, he adopts the term, “I speak, not the Lord.” But lest we should imagine that he takes upon himself thus to affirm without Divine illumination, in the one case he assures us that he gives his decision as one that had obtained mercy of the Lord to be found faithful, to be a faithful dispenser of Divine truth through the grace given to him; in another (v. 40), he gives yet more definite expression to this sentiment; for having pronounced her, who should remain a widow after her husband’s decease, happier, according to his judgment, he adds, as the warrant for this his judgment, *δοκῶ δὲ καὶ γὰρ, πνεῦμα Θεοῦ ἔχειν*—not merely “I suppose,” “I think,” but “I know;” “scio, cognitum et perspectum habeo,” that I am speaking under Divine inspiration. A theory of complete verbal inspiration is not at all essential to the maintenance of the position held by our Church, that the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament not only contain God’s Word, but are God’s Word written. Nor are the teachers of our Church called upon to lay down any new theory of inspiration; but rather to invite all her true and faithful sons

and servants to adopt, *ex animo*, that declaration which our Church puts into the mouth of each of her ordained ministers, of unfeigned belief in all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as the written Word of God, and to teach their people from it, as having that Divine authority. It is eminently satisfactory to me to find that this view of inspiration is in exact accordance with the opinion which my venerated predecessor expressed to you seven years ago. You may remember that he used this apt illustration: "Take," said he, "for example, the case of an earthly sovereign desiring to issue a proclamation to his subjects, or to send a message to a foreign potentate. He communicates his intentions to one of his confidential servants, and commands him to commit them to writing. But he does not fail to overlook what is written before it is made public. The minister indites the message in words of his own; but the sovereign makes sure that the words correctly represent his intentions."

It may, however, be objected,—“If this be your view of the authority of Holy Scripture, how will you reconcile some of its statements with the more recent discoveries of science?” I confess that, to my own apprehension, far too much alarm has been felt in some quarters from the supposed antagonism between the Bible and Science.

The Bible and Science. We should beware of allowing our faith

to be disturbed by such considerations ; nor should we suffer it to depend upon an issue on which God never intended that it should rest. The Word of God does not profess to teach us science ; the object of revelation is not to instruct us as to the secrets of nature, but to make us wise in matters pertaining to our salvation. It is to teach those who feel themselves to be fallen and lost creatures, that they are not irrecoverably lost ; that God has sent His Son as a Redeemer to atone for their sins, by His Sacrifice on the Cross, and His Holy Spirit as a Sanctifier, to cleanse the thoughts of their hearts, and support them in their seasons of trial and temptation. The Word of God may incidentally touch upon subjects bearing upon physical science ; but it never introduces them with the view of affirming scientific truth. The expressions connected with it occur in the historic narrative, or in the poetry of the Bible, and are intended to be such as would be intelligible to those for whose edification it was written. No one now supposes that the Bible contradicts the true system of the heavens, because it is said in the Book of Joshua that the sun stood still, and the moon stayed until the people had avenged themselves of their enemies ; nor should any of us be accused of denying its truth, because we habitually speak of the sun rising and setting, instead of expressing ourselves in the strict language

of astronomy. Unless, therefore, the Word of God distinctly enunciates a proposition to be received as revealed scientific truth (and I know not where it does so), we need not allow ourselves to be perplexed by any apparent discrepancy between the two. This, also, may well be taken into account, that some branches of science, the conclusions of which are supposed to be at variance with the statements of Holy Scripture, are acknowledged by their own disciples to be in a very imperfect state, while many of those conclusions are of an uncertain and conjectural character, being still disputed by persons learned in the same department. Those who, like myself, sat half a century ago at the feet of the earlier professors of Geology, will remember the many fluctuations of opinion as to some of their tenets; and may be pardoned, if we hesitate to accept as indisputable, theories which at present seem to rest on but doubtful foundations.

To science I would not venture myself to address any words of admonition. I would rather borrow the eloquent and impressive language of one of the most profound reasoners of this or of any other age; of one, who confesses that he has borne the burthen of objections to the Christian system, and to each of its essential dogmas; who has experienced the anxieties of doubt, but now comes forth to tell us

how he has escaped from those doubts, and what are the grounds of his present convictions. Monsieur Guizot, in the earlier part of his recent work, entitled "Meditations on Christianity," had spoken of the great instincts of our nature, of the moral problems that beset man's thoughts, the sublime requirements which must be satisfied, if he would have rest and peace; such as the question as to human liberty, the origin of evil, the imperfection of the present state of things, and the final destiny of man; problems which God's Word alone has enabled us to solve; and in reference to these, he afterwards says,—“ Science is a splendid thing; it is also a noble privilege of man, that God, in creating him an intelligent and free agent, has given him a capacity to desire, and to possess through study, the truths of science, and even to attain them in a certain measure, and in a certain sphere. But when science attempts to exceed that measure, and to quit that sphere; when it ignores and scorns the instincts, natural, universal, permanent instincts of the human soul; and when it essays to set up every where its own torch, in the place of that primitive light which lights mankind, then, and from that cause alone, science fills itself with error; and this,” he adds, “ is the very case which called forth those words of Jesus, ‘ I praise Thee, Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth, that Thou hast hidden these

things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes⁶.’ ”

Let science then pursue her own investigations, and let us not be ever imagining that she entertains designs hostile to God’s Word, but in quietness and confidence devote ourselves to the duties of our holy calling, in full assurance that our faith rests on foundations which it is impossible that any human efforts can subvert. There always have been those—and I trust their number will be increased in consequence of recent controversies—who have had leisure to give profound attention to the study of Biblical criticism, most necessary at the present day. It is satisfactory to know that so many able published replies, amounting already to about fifty, have been given to the recent attacks made on the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua. Thus has argument been fairly met by argument; and upon a careful examination and review of the principal treatises, it is evident that some of the objections to the authenticity and accuracy of the Five Books of Moses, and that of Joshua, are so frivolous that they in fact answer themselves; others have been answered long ago by able and learned critics⁷, and many have been plainly refuted by modern authors.

⁶ Guizot’s *Meditations on the Essence of Christianity*, pp. 289, 290.

⁷ See Appendix D.

Others, again, which are founded merely on conjecture, are met by conjectures equally probable ; while some may not yet have received their answer, but are not therefore to be deemed unanswerable. We may well afford to admit the difficulty, while we calmly await the solution. It would indeed be strange, if in documents more than three thousand years old, with no contemporary history or literature of any kind to illustrate them, and when it is impossible to call upon the authors for any explanation of their own meaning, there should be nothing hard to be understood, nothing which still baffled the researches of the critic and the antiquarian. Rather should we say that it would be an argument that these books were the production of some cunning impostor, if not a single difficulty presented itself in their pages. Continued investigation may disclose facts which will reconcile apparent inconsistencies, while fresh arguments may demonstrate fallacies yet undetected ; and it is remarkable that one vindication of the authenticity of the Pentateuch should have arisen in a new and very unexpected quarter ; a Mohammedan commentator on the Old Testament having undertaken to refute the recent attacks on the veracity of the Books of Moses. In India, the scene of this writer's labours, I regret to say, this antidote to the evil resulting from these assaults on Holy Scripture is much needed ; for they have

already proved, and are still proving a serious hindrance to the propagation of the Gospel in India, as well as in China: the Pundits welcoming the "Critical Examination" as a valuable auxiliary in their opposition to the diffusion of Christianity among the natives. And well may they so deem it: for blot the Pentateuch out of the Bible, and a large portion of Holy Writ would be unintelligible; whereas the Canonical Scriptures, as they stand at present, are a consistent whole, with the Five Books of Moses forming the grand prelude to the Advent of the Messiah.

It is my firm belief that if the negative school of theology, which claims the right of handling Holy Scripture with the freedom that has been manifested in the late attempts, shall pursue its course in the same direction, and in the same spirit, it will before long work out its own condemnation. It must soon exhibit the manifest consequences to which its principles lead; a negation of all that is distinctive in Christianity; and then will follow that which has already to a large extent been witnessed in Germany—a yearning after a definite system of religious belief which shall meet the wants and cravings of our fallen nature, and a return to that belief which alone can satisfy them.

Judicial Committee of

Privy Council. Considerable alarm has been felt by many members of our Church as to the

ultimate consequences that may result from the recent decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, touching the inspiration of the Holy Scriptures and the eternity of suffering; and there has been much anxious questioning as to the fitness of that tribunal, as at present constituted, for the decision of cases involving the consideration of the doctrine held by the Church of England on these points.

There can be no doubt that the present Court of Appeal in Ecclesiastical Causes is more unfavourable to the Church than that for which it was the substitute. When all appeals to Rome were forbidden by the 24th of Henry VIII., c. 12, A.D. 1533, it was enacted that every cause ecclesiastical should be finally decided in the Archbishop's Court; excepting, that where the rights of the King were concerned there should be a final appeal to the Upper House of Convocation. Thus far, then, the last resort in each suit was to a Court composed solely of spiritual persons. In the next year a new system was introduced. In the case of every appeal in an ecclesiastical cause, a Royal Commission under the Great Seal was to be issued, appointing certain persons to hear and decide the same, no further appeal from their sentence being allowed, except that in extraordinary cases the King would issue a Commission of Review to revise the sentence delivered. This was the origin and constitution of

the Court of Delegates ; and the power which formerly belonged to the Pope, and with which the Archbishop was for a short time invested, thenceforth rested with the Crown. But in the statute constituting this Court of Delegates, a proviso was introduced, that when any cause touching the law divine or spiritual learning happened to come in question, then it was to be declared and interpreted by that part of the body politic called the Spirituality. In consequence of this provision, we find no trace of any temporal peer, or judge of the common law, being appointed to sit in the Court of Delegates on such a case, till the beginning of the seventeenth century. At a later period, the Court used usually to consist of about an equal number of bishops, of judges of common law, and of civilians, or doctors in civil and canon law ; and it continued to be the ultimate Court of Appeal till the year 1832. An Act was then passed transferring the final appeal in such cases from the Court of Delegates to the Privy Council. The Privy Council, however, was before long found to be a body too large to constitute a proper tribunal for these purposes, and a statute was passed in the following year, 1833, creating a Judicial Committee of the Privy Council as the final Court of Appeal in all matters which used to be brought before the Court of Delegates ; but no spiritual persons of the Privy Council were by law

appointed members of the Committee. This omission, however, was remedied by the Church Discipline Act of 1840, which provided that when any cause commenced under this Act should come before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, every Archbishop and Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland who is a Privy Councillor should be a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for that purpose. In spite of this improvement, the constitution of this tribunal for the final decision of causes involving questions of doctrine, cannot be deemed satisfactory. In the debate which took place in the House of Lords on the 3rd of June in the year 1850, with the view of amending the Act of 1833, and repealing the Church Discipline Act of 1840, Lord Brougham, who was himself the author of the former Act, is reported to have said, that it was his Bill which constituted the Judicial Committee; it was he also who had abolished the Court of Delegates. He believed his noble friend on the woolsack would agree with him that the abolition of the old Court of Review did take away from the Church, to a certain extent, the security which she had possessed for the soundness of her doctrines. He could not help feeling that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had been framed without any expectation that questions like that (alluding to the Gorham case) would be

brought before it. It was created, he said, for cases of a totally different kind; and he had no doubt that if it had been constituted with a view to such causes as the present, some other arrangement would have been made. Another leading orator in that debate (Lord Derby), evidently referring to the Statute of Appeals in Henry VIII.'s reign above quoted, said, "Nothing was more certain than that at the time of the Reformation it was intended to confirm to the Church the fullest power of declaring her own doctrines;" and in the year 1856 a resolution was passed by the Lower House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury to the effect, that "no arrangement would appear satisfactory which did not give full security that all questions involving points of doctrine should be dealt with, under the authority of the Crown, by the Spirituality, assisted by such legal persons as might be deemed necessary for the ends of justice." When we calmly consider this important and difficult subject, we shall at once perceive that with the theological question, there will always be a question of civil right also mixed up; and shall acknowledge it to be eminently desirable, if not absolutely necessary, that points of law, strictly so called, should be decided by those who have been thoroughly conversant with the principles which ought to guide such decisions. But where points of doctrine are involved, it is

equally reasonable that the legal members of the Court should have the Spirituality to guide them. So, it may be argued, they now have, by the Act of 1840. But the anomaly of the present system is, that whereas the Court of Appeal has to interpret the teaching of the Church (albeit of the majority of that Court some may not even be members of the Church of England, and all are sure to be laymen), a binding decision may be given as to what is that teaching, though all the ecclesiastical members of it be adverse to that view. The Church thus seems to be compromised by any such judgment (inasmuch as some of its prelates were sitting on that tribunal), although the voice of the Church in general might be adverse to the decision at which the Court arrived. For my own part, I have always considered that the preferable system would be to have the Court composed of laymen only ; that any question of doctrine should be submitted to the Bench of Bishops for their opinion ; but that this opinion should not be absolutely binding on the Court as to the sentence to be pronounced. Nor, indeed, could it be ; because, besides the question of doctrine, there would always remain the question of fact, whether or no the language with which the accused was charged was in truth repugnant to the terms in which the Church had enunciated her teaching. The Bench of Bishops, in delivering their opinion as to the

doctrine, would have absolved themselves from all complicity with the judgment delivered by the lay Court, and could not be held responsible for any sentence it might pass. I am well aware that there is much difference of opinion upon this point; but I have felt it my duty frankly to state my own to you; and I will not dwell further on this subject than to acknowledge that, imperfect as the present constitution of the Court must be allowed to be, I never would consent to the exclusion of the ecclesiastical members from it, unless some more satisfactory arrangement were agreed upon.

Now as to the judgment itself which has been recently pronounced by that tribunal, it is apprehended that it will have a prejudicial influence, as affecting the doctrine of the Church of England. But there are considerations which may tend materially to allay such apprehensions. In the first place it has been ruled by high legal authority that the judgment in the two recent cases does not necessarily, by implication or otherwise, furnish the means of determining, in the abstract, any of the legal questions raised by them; and that it would be impossible to attempt to derive from these decisions any rule for the determination of hypothetical cases, each of which must depend on its own circumstances⁸. All that we can directly gather from these

⁸ Appendix E.

two recent decisions is this, that the sentence of the judge of the Court of Arches has been reversed; that the two appellants have been acquitted; and that if any clergyman were to re-affirm, in precisely the same terms, what they were charged with asserting in the very limited extracts brought before the Judicial Committee, on the subject of Inspiration of Holy Scripture, and the salvability of what the writer considered as germinal and undeveloped souls, he might possibly be borne harmless by the decision; but that no general conclusions as to future decisions in similar cases can be drawn from the tenor of these judgments. To the sentence pronounced by the Court, however, our dutiful allegiance to the Crown requires us to pay implicit obedience; but this is wholly distinct from an acquiescence in the statements advanced as the ground of recommendation to Her Majesty⁹. Thus is their real import so greatly narrowed that much of the apprehension prevalent on their first publication will be seen to be groundless.

Considering then that the consciences of the Clergy will lead them to interpret in a natural sense the language of our Article, when it speaks of the Bible as “God’s Word written,” and that they can scarcely forget the pledge they gave their Bishop when he ordained them, that they believed all the Canonical Books of the Old and New Testa-

⁹ Appendix F.

ment ; seeing also that, to be consistent, they must deny an eternity of bliss to the saved, if they deny an eternity of suffering to the lost ; I feel that we have a very fair security that in future the peace of the Church will not be disturbed by publications such as were brought under the notice of the Court. And this the rather, when we remember the form, so unenviable to the acquitted, in which the acquittal was pronounced, intimating, in not very obscure terms, a moral, though not a legal condemnation. “ A few short extracts only,” say the Judges, “ were before us, and our judgment must be confined to the matter which is therein contained. If therefore the book, or these two essays, or either of them as a whole, be of a mischievous and baneful tendency, as weakening the foundations of Christian belief, and likely to cause many to offend, they will retain that character, and be liable to that condemnation, notwithstanding this our judgment thereon.” A wholesome warning this, which I trust will deter the speculative spirits that are sure to exist in so large a body of intelligent and educated persons as the Clergy of the Church of England from rashly obtruding their speculations upon the public, without counting the cost both to themselves and to many of their brethren, whose faith may be imperilled by the suggestion of doubts, without any clue to their solution.

I am quite willing to believe that the clerical

authors of their respective Essays and Reviews would have refrained from publishing them, at any rate in their combined form, had they been at all aware of the severe shock they would thus give to the great majority of their brethren in the ministry, as well as to the body of the attached lay members of our Church; feelings shared also by a large portion of pious Nonconformists, who acknowledge the scandal and offence thus caused to our common Christianity. For they, equally with ourselves, devoutly cherish the belief that the Bible is the Word of God, and would equally resist all attempts to disparage its authority, and weaken its hold upon the conscience. Indeed, I have good reason to know that sympathy with our Church in her present conflict with all who would undermine her fundamental doctrines, and advance the cause of infidelity, is not confined to our own country; but that in many distant parts of Christendom our present attitude of resistance to these aggressions is watched with keen and hopeful interest. Both in the Eastern branch of the Church Catholic, and among many devout Roman Catholics in the West, as also by numbers of the Protestant communities in France and Germany, it is felt, as I have reason to know, that our cause is common, as our danger is common; and apart from all narrow prejudice, they bid us God speed in our efforts, as we contend

earnestly for our common faith. This conjuncture of affairs seems to draw all more closely together ; and will, I trust, lead us to co-operate in an enlightened resistance to its adversaries.

It was the conviction that the Church of England was on her trial, and that she was bound to adopt all-lawful means of vindicating herself in the face of Christendom from all complicity with the erroneous and strange doctrines promulgated by some holding office under her, which prevailed with me to sanction the synodical condemnation of the book entitled *Essays and Reviews* ; a condemnation to which the passage above quoted from the Judgment almost invited us. I firmly believe the measure then adopted by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury to have been lawful, sanctioned as it was by the deliberate and unbiassed opinion of two of the most learned members of the legal profession¹ ; and I have never seen reason to repent the resolution I then took. At the same time I should strongly deprecate any tendency on the part of Convocation to give itself to such proceedings, to the neglect of those practically useful discussions in which it is generally engaged.

Seeing then, my reverend and dear Brethren, that we live in times in which we are emphatically called

¹ Appendix G.

upon to prove all things, in order that we may hold fast that which is good, it will not be unseasonable to dwell for a moment upon some thoughts that may serve as safeguards against the influence of plausible objections to certain opinions and articles of belief which we have been wont to hold sacred. Before we give ear to the difficulties of belief in any of these particulars, it will be well that we first fully weigh the difficulties of unbelief. There are, no doubt, things hard to be understood in the record of some of God's dealings with man, as narrated in the Bible; there may be some seeming inconsistencies in matters which a Christian is called upon to accept and believe. But is there nothing strange, no apparent discordance in the system which we are now invited to accept as an alternative? And if this be so, is it reasonable in those who have hitherto listened to the teaching of the Church to allow their attention to be engrossed exclusively by these objections, without reckoning the contradictions in which they will be involved by renouncing their former convictions²?

Let me illustrate this view by reference to the conclusions which we shall be compelled to admit, if we acquiesce in the positions lately maintained by persons holding office in our Church. We have

² Appendix H.

been wont to acknowledge our Lord Jesus Christ as a Teacher on whose guidance we may implicitly rely ; but if we embrace the new code of criticism, we must believe, either that He who knew what was in man, and could read the thoughts and intents of the heart, was ignorant whether Moses was the author of the Pentateuch or not, and that, being ignorant of it, He ventured to affirm what He did not know to be true ; or that, knowing it to be false, He did not scruple to utter the falsehood. We must believe that the Saviour of the world, having been convicted of ignorance or error in that which He undertook to teach, is still a Teacher on whom we may rely ; or, that we can no longer depend on His Word, and His Gospel may after all be a fiction. We must believe that the holy prophet Samuel was the author of a wilful fraud, and that the Israelites quietly acquiesced in this fraud, although the forged books contained threats and denunciations which were little likely to prepossess them in favour of the imposture ; and laid upon them a burthensome ceremonial, to which they would never have submitted, but upon the clearest evidence that it was of Divine authority. We must accept the Bible as a book to be handled with just as much freedom, and treated with as little reverence and respect, as any volume of purely human composition, although its effects in regenerating and converting hundreds of

millions of souls, and entirely changing the face of society among the most cultivated people in the world, prove it to be totally unlike any other book, and to be, in truth, the Word of God, and not the word of man. In reference to our Lord's ascription of the Pentateuch to Moses as its author, it has been argued, that as He is said to have increased in wisdom, as well as stature, there must have been a time when His wisdom was imperfect; and that this assertion may have been made previous to its maturity. But, though it may not be easy to pronounce the exact moment at which it reached perfection, we may be well assured that it must have been before He began to teach. Otherwise, if He has erred in one particular, He may have erred in all. The mysterious connexion of the divine and human nature in the Saviour, is beyond our comprehension; and it may be impossible for us to understand how, in spite of that union, He was still ignorant of the day on which the Son of Man should come in the clouds, with great power and glory, to summon before Him the quick and dead for judgment. It is one thing, however, for an inspired teacher to confess his ignorance on a single point, and quite another to profess knowledge, while he is really ignorant, on a subject on which he undertakes to teach. Where ignorance and error are detected under such circumstances, confidence in the instruc-

tion of the teacher must be destroyed ; and if we thus undermine the Saviour's authority, what sure ground have we for believing that He is accurate in any other branch of His teaching ? “ No one surely in his senses,” said Archbishop Whately, “ could really think that the God of Truth would send an inspired prophet into the world, who should confirm the people in their belief of a foolish legend intimately connected with their religion ; a prophet who could use such words as these,—‘ Moses wrote of Me, and if ye believe not his witness, how shall ye believe in Me ? ’ when, in truth, the pretended writings of Moses were entitled to no credit at all ³. ”

Conclusion. And now, my reverend and dear Brethren, I must draw my remarks to a conclusion. Glad should I indeed have been had I found fewer subjects of somewhat painful interest to dwell upon ; but my chief object has been to abate the alarm which was not unnaturally felt, when the recent judgment was supposed to have so much wider a scope than proves now to have been the case ; and to dissuade you from hastily committing yourselves to any particular line of conduct, in consequence of apprehensions which have less foundation than you imagined. We

³ Abp. Whately.

might indeed have given our undivided attention to the consideration of topics of a purely spiritual nature in connexion with our ministerial duties; but in times like the present, when unbelief is aggressive, it is well that we should try and examine the foundation on which our faith rests; that we should prove all things, hold fast that which is good, and thus become proof against the shafts of scepticism; that we should furnish ourselves with those weapons of argument with which faithful men have in different ages of the Church encountered the adversaries of revealed religion, so that we may wax stronger and stronger in our convictions by those means, as well as by the inward witness of the Spirit, which is our abiding support and comfort under every trial of our faith. And if the result of this shall be to quicken us in the discharge of our respective duties, we shall thus give the world the best proof of the sincerity of our own belief, and of the influence it is exercising on our hearts and consciences.

But although we have entire confidence that all will ultimately work together for good, still there must be great tribulation before the final triumph; and if we see some tokens of its approach, let us not think it strange concerning any trials that may come, as though some strange thing had happened to us. We should rather rejoice at such proofs of

the truth of God's Holy Word, which warns us, in language too plain to be misunderstood, that in the last days perilous times shall come ; that men shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits ; that the opposition to the doctrines which our Blessed Lord and His Apostles taught, will become more intense and more virulent as the day of the Lord approaches. The signs of the times, then, which multiply around us, should serve but for the more confirmation of our faith ; should quicken within us more glowing hope, bidding us lift up our heads, because our redemption draweth nigher. These questionings of the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel ; this denial of miracles, of the inspiration of Holy Scripture, of the necessity of an atonement for the sin of the world, and of the eternity of the sufferings of the lost, will lead us to look to the early conquests of Christianity, and observe what sort of teaching it was that gained these victories. It was surely no negative Christianity which achieved these triumphs ; a system that banishes from revelation its characteristic features, proposing to the believer no positive creed on which to rest beyond the existence of one God, and the fact that the Man Jesus Christ lived about eighteen hundred years ago, and uttered some wise sayings to which we should do well to take heed. It was not merely a system of pure morality which

turned the world upside down; it was not the preaching of the mercy alone of God, without any mention of His justice, and the impossibility of His clearing the guilty, who abide in impenitence. Such a creed as this we may be sure would have been no stumbling-block to the Jew, no foolishness to the Greek.

The Christianity which solved the great problems that have perplexed mankind, even the wisest among them, through all ages; which prostrated the idols of Greece and Rome, and changed the moral and social condition of the nations, turning them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan to the worship of the living and true God, was preached by those who taught the great doctrines of our holy religion as they have been ever held by the Church Catholic, and as they are now held by each branch of that Church: the corruption of our nature by the Fall; the Incarnation of the Son of God; redemption by His most precious blood; sanctification by the gift of the Holy Spirit; the Word of Christ and the Divinity of Christ confirmed by miracles; the Inspiration of Holy Scripture. These heaven-instructed missionaries preached to the listening nations the God of the Bible, not a god of man's invention and imagination; the Christ of the Gospels, and not the Jesus of His modern biographer, who pictures Him to his readers as half-sentimental enthusiast, half-cunning impostor. Such was the

Gospel which Paul found to be the "Power of God unto salvation," and in which hundreds of millions of our brethren in the flesh have, by God's grace, and of His free gift, found the like power to their souls' health; and this Gospel, reverend and dear Brethren, I trust we shall have grace to profess and maintain through evil report and good report; not seeking the praise of man, but the praise of God; looking to what will please our adored Master, and not what will please the world. These are not days in which we are ever likely to be called to resist unto blood: yet there may possibly be trials awaiting us, even severer than this. But though it may be our lot, in some way or other, to suffer for the truth, I trust we shall never allow ourselves to betray the truth by culpable indifference to its value. Let us meanwhile pray that the Church may come forth from her season of probation, purified as by a refiner's fire: let us pray that those who are leading the way in the direction of a negative Christianity, may see to what those principles are inevitably tending, and in time retrace their steps, as others have done before them; let us pray that whatever burthen it may please the Lord to lay upon us, we may be enabled to possess our souls in patience, and by our preaching and living, set forth the glory of Him who hath loved us, and washed us from our sins in His own Blood. Amen.

APPENDIX A.

ABSTRACT OF RETURNS FROM THE CLERGY.

Legally constituted benefices in the diocese, including 36 united or consolidated benefices, which are held by 363 incumbents: 20 of the incumbents holding 2 benefices by dispensation	383
Chapels of ease	14
Incumbents non-resident by licence	20
7 of these perform their own duty; 5 of the 14 incumbents mentioned below reside altogether or partially on their own preferment: all other in- cumbents are resident.	
Benefices held in plurality	14
Glebe-houses (of which 8 are unfit for residence) .	302
Glebe-houses erected during the last 3 years . .	21
Parishes still without glebe-houses	84
Churches in which there are two full services . .	317
„ „ is only one	46
Churches in which the sacrament of Baptism is ad- ministered at the stated times, when the congrega- tion may attend the service	220
Candidates for Confirmation confirmed by me since my accession to the see	8,537

Total number of communicants annually	16,255
Parishes in which the Holy Communion is adminis- tered weekly or oftener	13
" " twice a month or oftener	14
" " monthly or oftener	227
" " less than monthly	143
" " six times a year	19
" " less than six times a year	65
Scholars in day schools	32,315
Children in infant schools	8,264
Parishes in which there are adult schools in which the Clergyman takes an active part	128
Males and females in these adult schools	3,025
Scholars, boys and girls, in the Sunday schools	27,327
Churches consecrated during the last five years	11
Population of the diocese according to the Census of 1861	530,863
Area of diocese <i>acres</i>	914,170

APPENDIX B.

Total of Candidates ordained in each Decade during Thirty Years.

DEACONS.						PRIESTS.						
	Deacons ordained.	Graduates from			Candidates from other Colleges and Literates.	Candidates from Durham.	Priests ordained.	Graduates from			Candidates from other Colleges and Literates.	
		Oxford.	Cam-bridge.	Dublin.				Oxford.	Cam-bridge.	Dublin.		
1834 to 1843	*5,350	2,076	2,307	319	533	83	*5,022	1,996	2,194	294	71	435
1844 to 1853	6,656	2,188	2,596	537	1,045	290	6,255	2,095	2,551	505	141	963
1854 to 1863	6,009	1,771	2,207	382	1,403	246	5,869	1,821	2,204	398	245	1,201

* During the years 1834-5-6 Bristol was a separate and distinct Diocese, and during those years there were thirty-two Deacons and thirty-two Priests ordained for that Diocese, which are added to the *totals* of Deacons and Priests respectively ordained during the first decade.

Ages of the Clergy.

	All Ages.		Under 20.		20 years and upwards.		25	30	35	40	45	50	55	60	65	70	75	80	85 and upwards.
Clergy in 1851 ..	17,621				17,621	500	2,193	2,533	2,234	2,187	2,179	1,913	1,336	944	607	454	318	148	75
" " 1861 ..	19,195				19,195	387	2,021	2,548	2,475	2,414	2,018	1,950	1,868	1,472	942	582	319	130	69

APPENDIX C.

MEMORIAL.

To the Most Reverend the Archbishops and the Right Reverend the Bishops of the Provinces of Canterbury and York.

We, the undersigned, Clergymen of the Church of England, desire to approach your Lordships with the feelings of respect and reverence which are due to your sacred office.

We beg to express our conviction that the almost indiscriminate use of "the Order for the Burial of the Dead," as practically enforced by the existing statute of the Law, imposes a heavy burden upon the consciences of the Clergy, and is the occasion of a grievous scandal to many Christian people.

We therefore most humbly pray that your Lordships will be pleased to give to the subject now brought under your consideration such attention as the magnitude of these evils appears to require, with a view to the devising of some effectual remedy.

The above Memorial received nearly 4000 signatures in the month of June, 1851; it was presented to the Archbishops and Bishops; and in February, 1852, the following answer was received from his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury:—

"Lambeth, February 13th, 1852.

"REV. SIR,

"I have recently had the opportunity which I expected, of communicating to a large assembly of Bishops the Memorial re-

specting the Burial Service which you transmitted to me, signed by 4000 Clergy.

“The Bishops generally sympathize with the Memorialists in the difficulties to which they sometimes find themselves exposed with reference to the terms of that Service.

“But I am sorry to report, farther, that the obstacles in the way of remedying those difficulties appear to them, as at present advised, to be insuperable.

“I remain, Rev. Sir,

“Your faithful Servant,

“J. B. CANTUAR.

“Rev. W. F. Witts.”

APPENDIX D.

In reply to a former statement of mine, that many of his objections to the accuracy of the Pentateuch had been already met by Archbishop Ussher and Bishop Watson, the author of the "Critical Examination of the Pentateuch and the Book of Joshua" has asserted in the Preface to Part IV., p. 11, that he finds nothing, or next to nothing, in these writers of the kind referred to. I can only conclude that the author supposed I was referring to "Ussher's Annals," and that he was not aware of the existence of a posthumous work of the Archbishop's, entitled, "*Jacobi Usserii Chronologia Sacra, seu, Annorum et παιδοποιίας Patriarcharum, παροικίας Israelitarum in Ægypto, Annorum etiam Judicum, Regum Judæet Israelis, ἀπόδειξις Chronologica. Opus posthumum, hucusque ἀνέκδοτον.*" Oxoniæ, A.D. 1660.

Any one who will take the trouble to examine that volume will discover a series of elaborate dissertations on subjects connected with the early History of the Bible; and in the Tenth Dissertation, pp. 169 and 170, he will see the whole question respecting Hezron and Hamul, the descendants of Judah, elaborately discussed. In the Eleventh Dissertation, pp. 184—187, he will meet with a complete answer to the objection founded on the recorded multiplication of the descendants of Jacob prior to the Exodus. The calculations contained in this part of Dissertation XI. also solve the author's difficulties respecting the number of Danites and Levites at the period of the Exodus. Bishop Watson the author passes over very lightly; but, in support of my own assertion, I will merely mention that the author had been anticipated by the celebrated infidel, Thomas

Paine, in the nine following objections ; all of which have received their answer from Bishop Watson in the course of three letters addressed to Thomas Paine, occupying sixty pages in his *Apology for the Bible* :—

(1) Founded on the occurrence of the name of Dan, Gen. xiv. 14.

(2) ————— the allusion to the Kings of Israel, Gen. xxvi. 31.

(3) ————— the sun standing still, Josh. x. 13.

(4) ————— the expression “Unto this Day,” Deut. xxiv. 6.

(5) ————— the bed of Og, King of Bashan, Deut. iii. 11.

(6) ————— the slaughter of the Midianites, Numb. xxxi.

(7) ————— the difference between the Fourth Commandment in Exodus and Deuteronomy, Exod. xx. 8—11 ; Deut. v. 12—15.

(8) ————— the difference between the terms Nabi and Roch, 1 Sam. ix. 9.

(9) ————— the argument that the date of the writer of the Book of Deuteronomy cannot be earlier than the time of Samuel.

And yet according to the author of the “Critical Examination of the Pentateuch,” Bishop Ussher and Bishop Watson say nothing, or next to nothing, in the nature of an answer to his objections.

APPENDIX E.

Opinion given by Sir Roundell Palmer and Sir H. M. Cairns in Answer to certain Questions proposed to them by Dr. Pusey :—

“We are of opinion that the judgments of the Privy Council in the recent cases of Dr. Williams and Mr. Wilson, do not, by necessary implication, or otherwise, furnish the means of determining, in the abstract, any of the legal questions raised by the present case.

“We understand these judgments merely as deciding—that, in those particular cases, there was no offence against the law pleaded or proved, unless the exact propositions stated by the Lord Chancellor could be deemed to be embodied in the formal and dogmatic teaching of the Church of England, so as to be rigorously binding upon every Clergyman, which they were held not to be. But it would be most unsafe, and, in fact, impossible, to attempt to derive, from these decisions, any rule for the determination of other hypothetical cases, each of which (if it should ever assume a practical form) must depend upon its own circumstances.

“This is the only answer we can give to the questions proposed to us.

“ROUNDELL PALMER.

“H. M. CAIRNS.

“*Lincoln's Inn, June 7th, 1864.*”

APPENDIX F.

Opinion of Sir Roundell Palmer and Sir H. M. Cairns as to the value of the reasons given by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in any particular case :—

“We are clearly of opinion that the 1st and 37th Articles referred to in the 36th Canon simply affirm the proposition that the cognizance and determination of all causes, ecclesiastical and temporal, belong to the Sovereign, and to the courts established and allowed by the Sovereign; and that no other tribunal for this purpose ought to be acknowledged either in or out of the realm.

“The observancy of these Articles will of course involve, among other things, obedience and respect to any judgment, that is, to any sentence which the Sovereign may pronounce in an ecclesiastical cause on the recommendation of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; but this is wholly distinct from an assent to or acquiescence in the reasoning or statements pursued or advanced by members of the Judicial Committee as the grounds of their recommendation to Her Majesty.

“It is to be observed, that the Judicial Committee are not under any obligation that we know of to state to the public¹ what are the reasons for their recommendation to the Sovereign in any particular case. The reasons may be inadequate to justify the recommendation; different members of the committee may express or act upon different reasons. The committee may in one case base their recommendation on reasons widely differing

¹ 3 and 4 Wm. IV. c. 41 requires the nature of the report or recommendation to be stated in open court.

from the reasons on which they have previously based their recommendation in a case precisely similar. The Sovereign may proceed upon the recommendation given without concurring in the reasons assigned, if, indeed, reasons are assigned in the report or recommendation to the Sovereign. But it is not necessary, or even, as we believe, usual, to assign reasons in the report or recommendation to the Sovereign: it is to the sentence of the Sovereign, and to that alone, that the subjects of the Sovereign, both lay and clerical, have to look; and it is the sentence which those who are affected by it have to obey. The sentence in the case of *Wilson v. Fendall* is not before us, but we understand it to be simply a sentence reversing a decree of the Court of Arches, which had suspended the appellant on a charge of heretical teaching or writing.

“We believe that these observations answer in substance all the questions put to us; but we add, by way of specific reply to question four, that we are clearly of opinion that it is not in any way unlawful for clergymen, either singly or together, in their preaching or otherwise, to affirm that the Church of England and Ireland maintains, without reserve or qualification, the inspiration and divine authority of the whole canonical Scriptures, as not only containing but being the Word of God; and further, in the words of our blessed Lord, that the punishment of the cursed, equally with the life of the righteous, is everlasting.

(Signed)

“ROUNDELL PALMER.

“H. M. CAIRNS.

“19th March, 1864.”

APPENDIX G.

Opinion of Mr. Rolt and Sir Hugh M. Cairns as to the legality of a Synodal Censure by the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury :—

“We are of opinion that the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury is not estopped by the 25th of Henry VIII., c. 19, or by any other statute, from expressing by resolution, or otherwise, their condemnation or disapprobation of a Book, although no special Royal Licence is given for the purpose.

“Exception was taken early in the last century to the proposal of Convocation to pass Synodal censure on a sermon preached by Bishop Hoadley ; but it was not alleged that they were disabled by statute from so doing.

“JOHN ROLT.

“H. M. CAIRNS.

“*Lincoln's Inn, June 16th, 1864.*”

APPENDIX H.

There are some thoughts in Coleridge's “Aids to Reflection,” which follow out this idea in a very interesting and striking manner. Sequelæ to Aphorism IX., pp. 186 to 190. Ed. Moxon. 1861.





